

Thought of the Day: The Legend of Brock Lesnar

As you may have heard, Paul Heyman's client Brock Lesnar conquered the Undertaker's Streak at Wrestlemania, becoming the 1 in 21-1. Since then, Brock has been seen once on WWE TV and.... That is the most brilliant thing WWE could have done with him. For the last three months, Paul Heyman has reminded us of Brock Lesnar. We've heard of him doing the impossible and being the monster that even the Undertaker couldn't stop. As time has gone on, that's the image that people have gotten in their heads: Brock Lesnar as an unstoppable beast that destroyed the Undertaker without breaking a sweat, instead of Brock Lesnar having a war with Undertaker and barely beating him. The longer you know that he's lurking, the bigger an impact his return makes. They're building up his mystique and that's the best thing they could have done.

Remember to follow me on Twitter @kbreviews and pick up my new book of on the History of Survivor Series at Amazon for just \$3.99 at:

And check out my Amazon author page with wrestling books for under \$4 at:

Thought of the Day: They've Done Enough

This is something that really should just be a courtesy.

I've been watching the ECW pay per views lately and far too

often it seems like they're expecting the fans to do a lot of work to know what's going on. A lot of promotions have this problem, but here's a good example of it from Barely Legal.

Taz vs. Sabu was one of the main events and billed as the grudge match of the century. That sounds like a cool idea and something that might draw an audience, but it leads to an obvious question: why were they fighting? The fans in attendance and ECW diehards probably knew, but the fans at home were never told. I only found out later because an ECW fan told me about it on WrestleZone.

Here's the thing: wrestling fans, be it at home or in the arena, should not have to do a single thing other than watch the show to know what's going on and why the current match/angle is taking place. Asking fans to do research or watch a bunch of shows is not only unfair, but rude to the fans. Sure all of the story can be found if you watch the TV shows, but a promotion shouldn't punish fans for only watching one show.

This might need some clarification. Obviously you can't present the entire story in full detail every single time. Let's go back to Taz vs. Sabu. Here's what would have solved this whole problem.

Joey Styles: "Of course Taz and Sabu have a long history together. They feuded over the TV Title when Taz arrived in the organization but one day two years ago Sabu took a booking in Japan and blew off an ECW commitment. Taz was furious and swore that he would get his hands on Sabu. Tonight is his chance for revenge and make no mistake about it, Sabu hates Taz every bit as much for all the shots he's taken at Sabu over the years.

That took me twenty seconds to write and even less to read. It tells the fans everything they need to know (that's a key point. There's a difference between everything there is to

know and everything you NEED to know) about the feud in one statement. WWE is guilty of this too as often times they just expect you to get their stories and why we're supposed to care about someone.

Fans should never have to do a thing other than watch a show. They're already doing the promotion a favor by giving them their time or money. Think about it like this: if you go to a restaurant, you're not expected to bring your own silverware or wash the dishes after your meal. You're there, you pay, you get full service in return. Wrestling companies should never ask their fans to do more than enjoy the show.

Thought of the Day: Tempus Fugit

Something people don't realize about Nitro. It was on the air for less than six years. It ran all of 1996-2000, four months in 1995 and three months in 2001. If you jump back that far in modern WWE, it would be about January 2009. That's before Sheamus debuted and when ECW on SyFy was still on the air. In that span of time, Nitro would have debuted, risen to the top, and been off the air. That's really not that long in WWE time.

Adding on to that, the losing streak for Raw was 86 weeks (or something like that as it changes every time I hear it). That's about a year and nine months, or if you flash back from today, roughly October 2012. That's when Ryback still meant something and CM Punk was still WWE Champion. It really isn't that long a stretch of time, but man alive did a lot of stuff happen in that span about 17 years ago.

Thought of the Day: Everything Turns, Turns, Turns

People say this is the solution to so many problems, but it doesn't make sense when you think about it. So the solution all the time is to just turn the guy heel or face. The problem with that is very simple: if they're doing the same boring stuff over and over again but to the other half of the locker room, it's only going to make them interesting for a few weeks. You have to change the character itself for there to really be any difference. It's like saying the wood in your house is rotting so let's paint it to make things better. If you don't change what's wrong inside, just switching its direction isn't going to fix anything long term.

Thought of the Day: Next!

With regards to Roman Reigns. The line you hear is that REigns is supposed to be the next John Cena. For the life of me I can't see that happening. Reigns just doesn't have the talking skills and doesn't come off as an alpha male like Cena or any other top guy. What I can however see is Reigns as the next Batista or Goldberg. That's not a bad place to be in and would put him as one of the top guys in the company for a very long time.

Thought of the Day: Something To Remember About The WWE Network

In light of the stock nosediving tomorrow, here's something people seem to be forgetting. The Network is less than three months old. This isn't something that they have a path to follow as no wrestling company has done this before. The Network is going to be around for a LONG time and people are going to watch it. That's something else: it's not a one time purchase. It's \$10 a month per fan, every month. That's a steady stream of money coming into the product, which really is awesome when you get involved with it.

Again, yesterday was a very bad day, but the Network is a long term plan and always has been.

Remember to follow me on Twitter @kbreviews and pick up my new book of on the History of Clash of the Champions at Amazon for just \$3.99 at:

And check out my Amazon author page with wrestling books for under \$4 at:

Thought of the Day: Ability

Is In The Eye Of The Announcers/WWE Is Like A Video Game

It's something WWE is horrible at anymore.

I'm watching a One Night Only show and the announcers are actually making it sound like the lower level guys have a chance against the bigger names. This is something that gets on my nerves about WWE. If you have say Damien Sandow against John Cena, the announcers will spend half the match basically laughing at Sandow and saying he has almost no chance at winning. Today, ROH is great at making you believe anyone can beat anyone on any given night.

This is something Gorilla Monsoon was a master at doing right. No matter who was in the ring, he would make you believe that either guy could win. He'd play up the successes that the lower guy had been having lately and talk about how they have that one big move that would end a match against any opponent. Today's wrestling sees so many finishers being made to look worthless that there's no reason to believe they're going to end a match.

Back in the day when I played No Mercy on a daily basis, (and I'm assuming it's the same with these newfangled games) the strategy would be to get to Special Mode as soon as possible and hit your finisher three times in a row. It wouldn't end the match, but it would soften your opponent up enough to give you a big advantage. The thing is, wrestling doesn't work that way outside of a game. Just hitting the same finisher over and over again doesn't make something look interesting. It should finish a match, and back in the day it would. Between that and the commentators treating big names like jobbers half the time, you can guess almost any match result anymore.

Thought of the Day: What's In A Name (I think I've Used This Title Before)

I got this one from an old TNA PPV. Back in 2002 there was a tag team called the Hot Shots. They weren't a great team, but they could only go so far with a name like that. It's so generic and uninteresting that people aren't going to care about it all that much. That's the case with any wrestler. Look at a guy like Ziggler for instance. Great look, talented, over....but his name is Dolph Ziggler. When you hear that name, it's not something you picture as intimidating or interesting. Odds are it would make a lot of people chuckle and crack a joke about how pathetic it sounds.

There are some names that are going to work no matter what because they just sound cool or strong or intimidating. The name John Cena for example works this way. No it doesn't describe him or give you a mental picture, but it's a solid name that doesn't make you laugh or write him off because you see him. The same is true for someone like Randy Orton. Not great, but it's not bad enough that it makes you roll your eyes. Adding The Viper to it helps a lot.

Then there are names like Edge or Batista or Undertaker. Those names are enough to catch someone's attention or make them think that someone is cool just because of their name. Imagine if Undertaker had this entrance:

Coming down the aisle, from Death Valley. Weighing in at 327 pounds.....DARREN YOUNG! It just doesn't work well at all, because Darren Young sounds like a name you would see on an

accountant's office at tax time. The name Darren Young doesn't make me think of a wrestler or someone intimidating. It makes me think of an average guy, which isn't what I watch wrestling to see.

A name needs to be interesting instead of something generic. It can make a huge difference in a career.

Thought of the Day: Your Time Is My Time

Concerning Rock, Lesnar, Undertaker, RVD etc. One of the most common criticisms about wrestlers such as these is that they're part timers and shouldn't be given top spots. My reaction to this: why in the world shouldn't they be?

Here's the thing about guys like this: yeah they're part timers, but they sell tickets. WWE is supposed to stick with their people that don't do as well instead of someone like Brock who is a guaranteed draw because of some loyalty? That's great. They can be loyal the whole time business goes down because they don't want to offend the feelings of some of their employees.

Look at Punk for example. Yeah he worked hard for a year as champion and had a very entertaining run. That's all well and good, but Rock sells more tickets and merchandise than him with relative ease. WWE would be foolish to stick with Punk because he had been there all this time instead of going with Rock who can make them a lot more money in a hurry.

This part timers shouldn't get pushed theory comes off like some of the markiest stuff in the world. It's a business people, and if the part timers do the most business then that's what we're going to get. That's WWE's thinking and it's very logical and successful.

Thought of the Day: I Remember It Differently

I got to thinking about Roddy Piper today. I find it interesting that most fans of my age (26) remember Roddy Piper as the mother of all heels. The reason it's interesting is Piper was barely a heel at any part of my life. He turned face in early 1987 and remained that way pretty much for the rest of his career, save for a quick run in WCW in 1999 when everything was nuts and a two month run in 2003. That speaks volumes about his heel run in the 80s as he went from that to a huge face for the next 25 years or so but is still remembered as a heel.